

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the claim amendments may be found at least at page 13, lines 1-13 of the original specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 9, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action at page 2 states that the “claims include the term “optionally” such language renders the claims indefinite failing to distinctly claim the subject matter, therefore the limitation will not be considered in the claims.” Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 17 to remove the term “optionally.” As such, Applicants request that the § 112 rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Raman (U.S. Patent 5,748,186) (hereinafter ‘Raman’). Applicants respectfully submit in response that Raman does not anticipate the claims of the present application because Raman does not disclose every element and limitation of the claims. For example, Raman does not disclose a parameter type to be used in parsing received speech, wherein the parameter type identifies a type of a parameter, wherein the parameter is received from a user after the key phrase and controls a presentation control instruction corresponding to the presentation action that is invoked by the user speaking the key phrase, as claimed here.

In contrast to the claims of the present application, Raman describes a process for interactively presenting multi-media information that includes links. *See* Raman at

Abstract. Part of Raman's process includes momentarily pausing the presentation to present a user with an opportunity to select a link. *See* Raman at column 4, lines 13-15. Raman describes that the user may verbally select the link using a voice input unit. *See* Raman at column 4, lines 13-15. That is, Raman's verbal selection of the link invokes an instruction to display content associated with the link. However, Raman does not disclose that after providing the verbal selection invoking the instruction, the user then further provides a parameter that controls the instruction associated with the verbal selection of the link. Because Raman discloses a process where a user merely invokes an instruction by providing a verbal selection of a link without further providing a parameter that controls the instruction, Raman does not disclose a parameter type to be used in parsing received speech, wherein the parameter type identifies a type of a parameter, wherein the parameter is received from a user after the key phrase and controls a presentation control instruction corresponding to the presentation action that is invoked by the user speaking the key phrase, as claimed here. Because Raman does not disclose every element and limitation of the claims, Raman does not anticipate the claims of the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 102. As such, Applicants request that the § 102 rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8, 16, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Raman in view of Josephson (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0023435) (hereafter "Josephson"). Claims 8, 16, and 24 depend from claims 1, 9, and 17. Because the proposed combination of Raman and Josephson relies on the argument that Raman teaches each and every element of independent claims 1, 9, and 17, and because Raman in fact does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1, 9, and 17, the proposed combinations cannot teach or suggest all the claim limitations of dependent claims 8, 16, and 24. The proposed combination of Raman and Josephson therefore cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and the rejections should therefore be withdrawn.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0447 for any fees required or overpaid.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 23, 2010

By: /H. Barrett Spraggins/
H. Barrett Spraggins, Reg. No. 64,737
Biggers & Ohanian, LLP
P.O. Box 1469
Austin, Texas 78767-1469
Tel. (512) 472-9881
Fax (512) 472-9887
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS